

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,496	11/06/2003	Yutaka Tosaki	Q78309	7626
65565 SUGHRUE-2	7590 12/09/200 65550	8	EXAMINER	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW			DESAI, ANISH P	
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/701,496	TOSAKI ET AL.		
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ANISH DESAI	1794		
All Participants: Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection				
(1) <u>ANISH DESAI</u> .	(3)			
(2) Mr. Michael Raucci (Attorney).	(4)			
Date of Interview: 4 December 2008	Time: <u>10:30</u>			
Type of Interview:	nt's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed: All generically				
Claims discussed:				
Prior art documents discussed: Cooprider et al. (US 5571617) and Michio et al. (EP 0661302A1)				
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 				
/D. Lawrence Tarazano/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794				
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature - if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner asked Applicant's attorney Mr. Raucci whether in claim1 Applicant intends to claim that the hydrophilic polymer is not reacted (i.e. copolymerized) with the acrylic polymer (A). After consulting with Applicant. Mr. Raucci informed the Examiner that in the adhesive tape of the claimed invention, hydrophilic polymer is not reacted with the acrylic polymer. The Examiner stated that it appears that the prior art discloses a single polymer instead of mixture of acrylic polymer and hydrophilic polymer as claimed.